



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/287,664 04/07/99 RUSSO

D 01222.0034-0

IM62/0607
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT
AND DUNNER
1300 I STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

BRUNSMAN, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1755

DATE MAILED:

06/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/287,664

Applicant(s)
Russo et al

Examiner
David M. Brunzman

Group Art Unit
1755



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Apr 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-32, 50, and 51 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-32, 50, and 51 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1755

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective (see 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414) because of the following:

The reissue oath/declaration must comply with every requirement of 37 C.F.R. 1.63 as well as the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.175(a)(2) and 1.175(b)(1). A substitute reissue declaration is required. The *substitute* reissue declaration filed fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.63 (a) (3) in that it does not include the residence, post office address or citizenship of each inventor and fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.63 (a) (4) in that it does not explicitly state whether the inventors are sole or joint

Claims 1-32, 50 and 51 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the declaration is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

The original patent, or an affidavit or declaration as to loss or inaccessibility of the original patent, must be received before this reissue application can be allowed. See 37 CFR 1.178. A response to this action without such will be held non-responsive.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 1755

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 50 and 51 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 33-60 of copending Application No. 08/544212. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Claims 33-60 of 08/544212 teach the product by a process comprising oxidizing similar metal oxide precursors and similar accelerants, while the instant claims, although different in scope, are drawn to a film comprising metal oxides and the deposition products of an accelerant.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. The examiner cannot indicate the allowability of an application until the issue of double patenting is resolved. Furthermore, the examiner could not allow one of a group of applications subject to provisional non-statutory rejections over each other to issue when such applications are subject to interference proceeding because such an application will not issue before conclusion of the interference proceeding. Therefore, a terminal disclaimer must be timely filed in each application before prosecution can proceed further.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1755

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Brunsman whose telephone number is (703) 308-3454. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm eastern time. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell, can be reached on (703) 308-3823. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3599.

Art Unit: 1755

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

DMBrunsman
June 2, 2000



David M. Brunsman
Primary Examiner
Group 1755